

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 are all the claims pending in the present application. In the present Office Action, the Examiner maintains the same rejection set forth in the previous Office Action, and adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the present Office Action. Specifically, claims 1 and 3 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated over UK Patent Appln. No. GB 2326255A to Kaminsky et al. (hereinafter “Kaminsky”). Also, claim 2 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kaminsky, in view of Ando (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,715).

Applicant traverses the rejections of claims 1-3 as follows.

**§102(e) Rejections (Kaminsky) - Claims 1 and 3**

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, and the Examiner adds a few new arguments in the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action on pages 5 and 6.

In the Amendment dated August 23, 2004, Applicants argued that Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest, “method includes defining in the local system classes replicating the hierarchy of classes in the remote system and including means of access to said classes in the remote system in order to enable use in the local system of instructions specific to classes defined in the remote system,” as recited in claim 1. That is, Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest any replicating of a hierarchy of classes. Further, Applicants argued that Kaminsky describes that classes are distributed to one location or to another, however, Kaminsky does not disclose or suggest the specific limitations of claim 1. In response, the Examiner alleges:

Regarding the limitation replicating a hierarchy of classes, Kaminsky does provide replicating of object by identifying and determining the objects residing on the first and second computer (page 2, lines 30-40). Applicants make general allegations and does not point out any error in the Office Action. Therefore, the rejection is proper and maintained herein.

In response, Applicants submit that the portion of Kaminsky cited by the Examiner in the above paragraph supports Applicants' argument that Kaminsky describes that classes are distributed to one location or to another. That is, the above-cited portion of Kaminsky describes:

1) determining which objects are to reside on a first computer and a second computer, and 2) generating a first proxy for the first computer and a second proxy for the second computer for the respective objects that may accessed from a remote computer (i.e., classes are distributed to one location or another). Kaminsky, however, does not specifically teach or suggest the limitation of, "defining in the local system classes replicating the hierarchy of classes in the remote system and including means of access to said classes in the remote system in order to enable use in the local system," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest the unique combination of features recited in claim 1 (including the above-quoted limitation) and, thus, fails to anticipate claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 3, it was previously argued that Kaminsky fails to disclose or suggest a local system that includes a "proxy" for each interface of a remote system, as recited in claim 3. In response, in the *Response to Arguments* section on page 6 of the present Office Action, the Examiner states, without citing any support in Kaminsky, that, "Kaminsky does provide accessing remote programmed methods to proxies which reside locally on the computer." The Examiner further alleges that, "Applicant only makes general allegations [that]

do not point out any errors in the rejection.” In response, Applicants maintain the previously submitted argument, and submits that the only general allegations that are being made, are being made by the Examiner. For example, on page 6 of the present Office Action, the Examiner simply and generally states what Kaminsky allegedly teaches, without any support from the reference itself. Applicants specifically pointed out in the previous Amendment where Kaminsky only describes an interface X” interface of proxy X”, which is a proxy for an object X of a distributive program (Kaminsky: Abstract; page 8, lines 34-36; and Fig. 1); this description in Kaminsky does NOT satisfy the requirement of a “proxy” for each interface of a remote system, as recited in claim 3. Therefore, Applicants have submitted specific arguments regarding the patentability of claim 3 over Kaminsky, however, the Examiner has not done the same. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, as well as the arguments set forth in the previous Amendment, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over Kaminsky.

§103(a) Rejections (Kaminski/Ando) - Claim 2

Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over Kaminsky and Ando at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1. Ando does not make up for the deficiencies of Kaminsky.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116**  
**U. S. Application No. 09/888,449**

**ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q64931**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 28, 2005